

**On the proper application of the name *Cambarus carolinus*  
Erichson.**

In 1846, Erichson applied the name *Cambarus carolinus* to a species of crayfish which had been collected by Cabanis in western North Carolina. His description was very brief, and it was with some hesitation that Hagen, in 1870, applied the name to specimens from the same region which seemed to possess the characters ascribed by Erichson to the species. Erichson's type was at the time inaccessible to Hagen as it had been deposited in the Berlin Museum. A few years later he was able to examine this type and in a note made at the time expressed the view that Erichson's *C. carolinus* was the same as his (Hagen's) *C. bartonii*. In view of this doubt, Faxon, in his Revision of the Astacidæ, proposed the application of the name *C. hagenianus* to Hagen's species in case it should prove to differ from Erichson's *C. carolinus*.

Through the kindness of Dr. Thiele of the Berlin Museum I have recently been furnished with an excellent photograph of Erichson's type together with drawings of the first abdominal appendages and the right chela. They show that the species is neither *C. carolinus* Hagen nor *C. bartonii* Fabricius, but *C. dubius* Faxon. It will be necessary, therefore, to substitute in most of the writings on this subject *C. hagenianus* Faxon for *C. carolinus*, and *C. carolinus* Erichson for *C. dubius* Faxon.

The extension of the range is slight as *C. carolinus* Erich. (= *dubius* Fax.) has been collected in abundance in southwestern West Virginia, and adjacent portions of Virginia.—W. P. Hay.

**Note on the names of the genera of Peccaries.**

My attention has been called to the nomenclature of the Peccaries and my opinion asked. In my Arrangement of the Families of Mammals, in 1873, I adopted Gray's genera *Dicotyles* and *Notophorus*, having ascertained that the two groups were differentiated not only by their skulls, but also by the leg bones. Recently (Proc. Biol. Soc., Wash., XIV, p. 119, 1901), Dr. Merriam has also adopted the two genera, but uses Fischer's name *Tayassu* (1814) for the genus *Notophorus* of Gray and gives a new one (*Olidosus*) to the *Dicotyles* of Gray.

It seems to me that we can with propriety retain both names, *Tayassu* and *Dicotyles*. Dr. Merriam quite properly substitutes *Tayassu* for *Notophorus* as both the nominal species of Fischer (*pecari* and *patira*) belong to the genus to which the latter name was given.

The name *Dicotyles*, however, originally covered species of both genera and Gray was justified by general usage in restricting the name as he did, although he would have done better to have given a new name to

the genus he called *Dicotyles* and retained the latter name for the one designated *Notophorus*.

We may now retain the time-honored names *Dicotyles* and *Dicotylidæ* and still adhere to rules of priority in the revival of the name *Tayassu*.—*Theo. Gill*.

### The technical name of the Virginia Deer.

Dr. J. A. Allen\* has recently proposed to change the technical name of the Virginia Deer from *Odocoileus americanus* to *Dama virginiana*, on the ground that the latter was used by Zimmermann† in correct nomenclatorial form many years before the proposal of *Odocoileus* by Rafinesque,‡ and in the same year as the publication of the specific name *americanus* by Erxleben.§ Zimmermann's terminology, however, is arranged with such disregard for the rules of binomial nomenclature that many of the names it includes are not entitled to recognition. A few instances will make this apparent. The genus *Canis* contains seven species designated as follows: 1. *Canis familiaris*, 2. *Canis lupus*, 3. *Hyena*, 4. *Hyena maculata*, 5. *Vulpes*, 6. *Lupus aureus*, 7. *Canis thous*. The first six species of *Viverra* are: 1. *Ichneumon*, 2. *Zibetha*, 3. *Genetta*, 4. *Fossana*, 5. *Putorius capensis*, 6. *Viverra tetradactyla*. Four of the species of *Lepus* are entered as follows: 3. *Lepus pusillus*, 4. *Cuniculus*, 5. *Cuniculus insigniter caudatus*, 6. *Lepus capensis*. Under *Jerboa* we find: 1. *Mus jaculus*, 2. *Cuniculus pumilio saliens*, 3. *Mus longipes*, 4. *Yerboa*, 5. *Yerboa gigantea*. Finally as species of *Cervus*: 1. *Alce*, 2. *Tarandus*, 3. *Dama*, 4. *Cervus Elaphus*, 5. *Cervus Axis*, 6. *Cervus procinus*, 7. *Dama Virginiana*, 8. *Cervus Capreolus*, 9. *Cervus Pygargus*, 10. *Cervus* (vel potius) *Capreolus mexicanus*, 11. *Cervus camelopardalis*. It is obvious that such names as *Hyena*, *Lupus*, *Putorius*, *Cuniculus*, *Yerboa*, *Dama*, and *Capreolus* were not proposed as generic terms, and that they cannot be considered as valid even when by chance they were used for members of modern generic groups. Most of them appear in the index or on the map of geographic distribution, for Zimmermann was consistent in the application of his system, the main feature of which was, in Dr. Allen's own words (l. c., p. 13-14) "...to cite the names given by previous writers as these authors used them, regardless of whether the generic element of the name conformed or not with his own genera." He also made free use of Latinized vernacular names without attempting to harmonize them with his generic terminology. By no code of nomenclature can terms applied in this manner be construed as valid technical names. Therefore unless some more cogent reason can be shown for its abandonment the current name *Odocoileus americanus* should continue in use for the Virginia Deer.—*Gerrit S. Miller, Jr.*

\*Bull. Am. Mus. Nat. Hist., XVI, pp. 18-20, February 1, 1902.

†Specimen Zoologiæ Geographicæ, p. 532, also in index and on map, 1777.

‡Atlantic Journal, I, p. 109, Autumn of 1832.

§Syst. Regni Anim., I, p. 312, 1777.